UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,523	01/22/2002	George M. White	2222.0820005	5053
	7590 05/17/201 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAMINER		
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			LERNER, MARTIN	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/17/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/057,523	WHITE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MARTIN LERNER	2626		

	MANTIN LENNEN	2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 May 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cortion (b)</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. $\square$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		ii be entered and an e.	xpianation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	(A.A. antima and a second		
	/Martin Lerner/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 2626	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants make a reasonable argument for the patentability of independent claims 59, 66, 73, 81, and 83, concentrating on the counter-arguments in the rejection directed to the VCR of Figure 4, but it is maintained that the features that Applicants are arguing are disclosed by Odinak in Figure 5. An audio system 20 has an audio receiver 50 that is connected to receive an audio signal over home electrical wiring, where audio receiver 50 is tunable to any of twenty available high-bandwidth audio channels. Additionally, audio system 20 has a control receiver 54 that receives control data using the low-bandwidth channel. (Column 5, Lines 5 to 20: Figure 5) Thus, Figure 5 clearly shows that audio system 20 receives high-bandwidth audio data over a high-bandwidth channel and low-bandwidth control signals over a low-bandwidth channel.

Notably, independent claims 66 and 73, directed to a method and computer-readable medium, do not actually require that a transceiver transmits both the high-bandwidth audio data and the low-bandwidth control data, only that the high-bandwidth and low-bandwidth channels transmit the data. Moreover, the rejection relies only on the language of the channels transmitting the data, rather than a transceiver transmitting the data, to be taught by Odinak. Thus, the rejection is proper.

Odinak discloses that controller 22 has a control receiver and a control transmitter that transmits control data using the low-bandwidth channel, and sets up a 'virtual connection' for the high-bandwidth audio data, so that controller 22 can be considered as a transceiver for high-bandwidth channels, too. (Column 5, Line 58 to Column 6, Line 11: Figure 1) While the independent claim language expressly quoted by Applicants only requires that a high bandwidth channel and a low bandwidth channel are configured to transmit the data, rather than that a transceiver is required to transmit both data, Odinak suggests that controller 22 can be implemented as a small computer, which is an overall framework for transmitting both the low-bandwidth and high-bandwidth data. Furthermore, it is reiterated that it would be an obvious expedient to integrate this function of a transceiver into receiver 46 and transmitter 50 of communications center 42 of Jacobs et al. because communications center 42 is responsible for transmitting all the information of Jacobs et al.